

All Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment by inserting Amendment Number 03 and date in Block 14 of the original SF 33 with your proposal submission.

For conformity purposes, a new SF Form 33, Solicitation GS00Q-13-DR-0002 and Attachments J.1. through J.10. are replaced in their entirety by this Amendment 03.

This Amendment 03 addresses questions received in response to the solicitation. This amendment also provides a number of edits to the original solicitation. Offerors should review all documents and changes carefully. In accordance with FAR 15.201(f), the questions and answers being shared are questions that could potentially impact the preparation of proposals in response to the solicitations. Comments, recommendations, and other feedback/questions received have been considered, but are not included.

Note: If your question has not yet been answered below by this Amendment it may be due to the fact that this latest Amendment answers your question by clarifying the language in the solicitation. Please review this amendment in its entirety. All future questions must pertain to this latest amendment to be considered.

Note: There may be questions below that pertain to the OASIS Unrestricted solicitation only. Please read accordingly.

The Solicitation closing date of TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17th, 2013; 4:00 P.M., CENTRAL DAYLIGHT TIME (CDT) remains unchanged.

THE PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT 03 IS TO:

- (1) Summarize the changes that were made to the solicitation;
- (2) Answer questions from prospective Offerors;
- (3) Re-issue a complete conformed solicitation (SF 33, Sections A through M, including all Attachments in Section J)

AMENDMENT 03 SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The following summarizes the changes to the solicitation by each section under Amendment 03, however, Offerors are advised to read the Amendment 03 solicitation and attachments in their entirety.

SF 33:

1. SF 33 was updated and replaced in its entirety.

SECTION A:

1. All terms and conditions in Section A remain unchanged.

SECTION B:

1. All terms and conditions in Section B remain unchanged.

SECTION C:

1. All terms and conditions in Section C remain unchanged.

SECTION D:

1. All terms and conditions in Section D remain unchanged.

SECTION E:

1. All terms and conditions in Section E remain unchanged.

SECTION F:

1. All terms and conditions in Section F remain unchanged.

SECTION G:

1. All terms and conditions in Section G remain unchanged.

SECTION H:

1. Section H.4.1. was updated to delete the reference to Section H.4.2.1.
2. Section H.4.2. was updated to delete the reference to Section H.4.2.1.
3. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION I:

1. All terms and conditions in Section I remain unchanged.

SECTION J:

SECTION J.1. LABOR CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS – Attachment (1)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.1. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.2. DIRECT LABOR RATE RANGES – Attachment (2)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.2. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.3. POOL IDENTIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION – Attachment (3)

1. Section J.3. was updated to remove the term CCR.
2. All other terms and conditions in Section J.3. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.4. PROPOSAL CHECKLIST – Attachment (4)

1. Section J.4. was revised to delete the file name requirement for Facility Clearances.
2. Section J.4. was revised under Volume 4 – Past Performance to separate file names for Pool Qualification Projects and Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects
3. Section J.4. was revised to correct a typographical error in the reference section to the Cost/Price Template.
4. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.5.1. SELF SCORING WORKSHEET FOR (PROPOSAL SUBMISSION) – Attachment (5A)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.5.1. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.5.2. SELF SCORING WORKSHEET (SAMPLE ONLY) – Attachment (5B)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.5.2. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.6. MODIFIED PRE-AWARD SURVEY (SF 1408) – Attachment (6)

1. Section J.6. was revised to replace “attach” with “provide” audit reports.
2. All other terms and conditions in Section J.6. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.7. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (PRIMARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (7)

1. Section J.7. was revised to replace “attach” with “provide”
2. All other terms and conditions in Section J.7. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.8. PAST PERFORMANCE RATING FORM – Attachment (8)

1. The Past Performance Rating Form was updated to remove Question 6. Utilization of Small Business, however if you already have a survey completed you do not have to submit a new survey. Small Business Utilization will be N/A regardless if it's on the form or not.
2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.9. COST/PRICE TEMPLATE – Attachment (9)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.9. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.10. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (SECONDARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (10)

1. All other terms and conditions in Section J.10. remain unchanged

SECTION K:

1. Section K.2. was updated to delete the reference to Section H.4.2.1.
2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION L:

Offerors are strongly advised to read Section L, Amendment 03, in its entirety. The following are a general summary of changes.

1. Section L.4. Format Table has been updated and replaced in its entirety.
2. Section L.5.1.2. was revised to delete references to Section L.5.4. and M.5.2.
3. Section L.5.1.2. was updated to clarify validation of NAICS or PSC Codes.
4. Section L.5.2.2 was updated to clarify that if an FPDS-NG report is on record, the FPDS-NG report takes precedence over any other documentation if there is a contradiction.
5. Section L.5.3.1. #2, One (1) year of performance was revised from: prior to the solicitation closing date to: no later than September 30, 2013. In addition, for one year projects, the requirement that it must have a past performance completed in PPIRS/CPARs is removed. PPIRS/CPARs report is only required if it's already approved in the system, otherwise a past performance survey is allowable.
6. Section L.5.3.1. #3, was updated to remove the requirement that each project be at least \$750K per year to the combined value of all 5 projects must be equal or greater than \$3.75 Million per year. In addition, the example was updated to reflect how a combined value of 5 projects will be calculated.
7. Section L.5.3.2. was updated to include PSC Code
8. Section L.5.3.2.1. was updated to include PSC Codes and to clarify NAICS Code and PSC Code validation
9. Sections L.5.5.5. through L.5.5.9. was revised to change the term "audit report" to "certification"
10. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged

SECTION M:

Offerors are strongly advised to read Section M, Amendment 03, in its entirety. The following are a general summary of changes.

1. Section M.4.3.2. was updated to clarify how that there are no pass/fails regarding minimum proposal submission requirements
2. Section M.4.4. was updated to clarify that pass/fail applies to the 3.0 past performance rating for both Pool Qualification and Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects and only Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects will be scored.

3. Section M.4.5. was updated to clarify how that there are no pass/fails regarding minimum proposal submission requirements.
4. Section M.5.1.1. was updated to allow PSC Codes for additional points on Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects and to correct the NAICS Code/PSC Code Table reference to Section L.5.1.2.
5. Section M.5.1.2. was updated to clarify the source for determining Mission Space #5 which is the directory of Agencies listed under www.usa.gov.
6. Section M.5.1.11. was revised to correct typographic errors.
7. Sections M.5.2. through M.5.2.3. clarified that these Sections apply to both Pool Qualification and Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects.
8. Section M.5.2.4. was revised to correct typographic errors in the Project Examples
9. Section M.5.3. was revised to delete the references to Sections L.5.1.7. and M.1.4.
10. Section M.6., Scoring Table was updated to include PSC Codes for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects
11. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged

AMENDMENT 03 QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The following are questions were submitted in response to the solicitation. Duplicative questions that were submitted are not always repeated.

1. L.5.3.1 sub-paragraph 2 states that “Each project must have been completed within the past Five (5) years prior to the solicitation closing date; or, be ongoing or completed with at least One (1) year of performance completed prior to the solicitation closing date; (Note: a project may be ongoing with less than One (1) year of performance only if the project has a past performance assessment completed in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and finalized in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS).”

Paragraph L.5.4. further cautions that “NO MULTIPLE AWARD IDIQ/BPA shall be used at the master contract level for past performance under any circumstances for any project.”

We have a scenario where we have a task on a multiple award contract supporting one customer and supported by one contracting office that is just a few days short of one year period of performance. On this contract, CPARS are only prepared for the whole contract, and not on individual task orders. A CPARS has been completed for this contract for a period that includes part of the POP for this task. Based on the combined guidance above, we have an eligible task that strongly supports our OASIS bid, but the Section L criteria is written in a manner that prevents us from submitting a past performance evaluation on the task. In order to be compliant, we recommend that a Past Performance Rating Form (J.8.) be allowed to be submitted in this case, as it will best capture performance on the task. An alternative is to allow the contract CPARS to be submitted for a multiple award MAC supporting one customer and supported by one contracting office. Failure to allow either one of these solutions creates a

disadvantage based on government decisions on completing CPARS on a MAC in support of one customer over which private industry has no control.

Response: See amended solicitation. We will allow the one year period to end September 30 instead of September 17. A past performance survey may be done for the project in question. This should resolve your situation.

2. L.2.3 Single or Multiple Awards: Is the max of multiple award for the top 40 a combination of all awards or is it 40 for large firms and then the top 40 SB?

Response: On OASIS SB, 40 awards will be made in each of the 6 OASIS SB Pools (possible 240 awards) and every single one of those awards will go to Small Business.

3. L.5.3.1 Pass/Fail Requirements for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects. Para (3) The combined annual value of the Five (5) project must be equal to or greater than \$25 million per year. No Individual Annual Project value shall be less than \$3 Million per year. What is the threshold for Small Businesses?

Response: The requirements you are listing apply to OASIS and not OASIS SB. The project requirements on OASIS SB are significantly lower. Please see Section L of the OASIS SB solicitation.

4. L5.5.6 ISO 9001:2008 Certification. Our firm recently completed our pre-audit phase and are scheduled for our 3rd Party ISO 9001:2008 audit for certification. May we receive credit if the registrar provides a letter regarding our status or shall we expedite our scheduled audit date to obtain the certification points?

Response: We cannot provide points for pending status. In order to earn those points, your firm would need to have the certification by the proposal due date.

5. **Reference: SF (30): Page 22, question 73.**

In its answer to Question 73, the Government states that a statement from the CO will suffice to explain how work on a contract that does not refer to R&D for Aircraft does contain such work. In our experience, the COR/COTR has the most direct knowledge of contract activities. Will a statement from a COR/COTR also suffice to support a NAICS exception?

Response: No, any clarification of contractual matters must be provided by the Contracting Officer.

6. We suggest that GSA modify Section L.5.3.2.1. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project to include the use of PSC codes of category R (depending upon the Pool qualifying for). The section would read something like "...will receive additional points if the project has a reported NAICS Code **or** Product Service Code (PSC) associated to the project...." along with other minor changes in this section to include "or PSC" where NAICs is referenced. The table in Section H.4.2. Predominant Task Order NAICS Determination would probably need to be amended also to add the PSC codes consistent with the table in Section L.5.1.2.

Response: See Amended Solicitation. We added the PSC option to the scoring matrix.

7. Section K.2. NAICS CODES AND SMALL BUSINESS SIZE STANDARDS and Section H.4.2. Predominant Task Order NAICS Determination both contain references to Section H.4.2.1. Section H.4.2.1. no longer exists and all references to Section H.4.2.1 should be changed to Section H.4.2.

Response: See Amended Solicitation We corrected the reference to H.4.2.

8. Can we use the Government Program Manager as a Primary or Secondary Reference?

Response: Yes.

9. Can we also use the Government Program Manager to serve as the Rater for the Past Performance Rating Form, Section J.8, Attachment (8)?

Response: Yes.

10. **Question:** For Federal Government agencies that do not use either the ISR/SF 294 or the SSR/SF 295 for subcontracting reporting, will GSA accept the agency-provided report format for small business goal reporting so that bidding contractors can receive applicable points for meeting or exceeding their small business goals?

Response: Yes, so long as it is official Government documentation, it is acceptable.

11. Per Section L.5.1.2 of the RFP, NAICS code 541710 was added to Pools 4, 5A, 5B, and 6. However, J.3 does not include NAICS code 541710 under Pools 4, 5A, 5B, and 6. Will GSA update attachment J.3 to reflect NAICS Code 541710 under Pools 4, 5A, 5B, and 6?

Response: Attachment J.3 only indicates which Pools are being applied for. It does not indicate all of the acceptable Pool Qualifiers. Those are found in L.5.1.2. We do not feel a change is necessary to the attachment.

12. According to Section 33.1 of the FAR, a contract may not be awarded until the pre-award protest has been resolved. Considering that requirements may change based on GAO recommendations pertaining to the pre-award protests, proposal submission requirements have already changed significantly with Amendment 1, and potential bidders are expending resources toward fluid and evolving requirements, will GSA reconsider extending the due date?

Response: We don't plan on awarding the contracts until the protest is resolved. However, we do plan on continuing our efforts up to the point of award. Amendment 1 primarily addressed editorial changes and did not significantly change proposal submissions. Accordingly, no extension of the due date is anticipated.

13. If the agency for which we performed a federal contract does not use NAICS codes, as required by L.5.2, may we self-certify the NAICS code applicability? In other words, may we submit our contract documents, including the Statement of Work, which will show the applicability of our federal contract work?

Response: No. In the event you have a federal contract that does not identify a NAICS code, does not identify a PSC code, and is not reported in FPDS, you may get a statement from the contracting officer that identifies the appropriate codes for the work performed.

14. M.5.2.4 Pages 133 – 134 contains examples of converting the adjectival scores into numerical scores. For Project #5, all the Task Order seem to have used a different scoring system – haphazard. Recommend correcting in the next iteration.

Response: See Amended Solicitation. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

15. Pg. 91, Sec. L, Para. L.5.1.2, For Task Orders, are Offerors allowed to submit the parent contract to show the NAICS for that particular Task Order?

Response: Yes

16. DoD is required by law to withhold inputting data into FPDS-NG for 3 months. As a result, Offerors whose primary clients are within DoD may not have accurate and complete data entered into FPDS. What are other alternatives for submitting project information to confirm contract dollar values and period of performance?

Response: Any contract documentation that contains the information may be submitted.

17. Pg. 23, Sec. C, Para C.4, It is unclear if the Government is saying that Ancillary support services are not integral, however included in the contract, or if the Government is saying Ancillary services are not in scope at all for this contract. Can the Government confirm that Ancillary support services are included in the scope of the OASIS contract in any form?

Response: Confirmed. Ancillary support services may be included on any OASIS task order if the services are integral and necessary to the overall professional service requirement.

18. Pg. 42, Sec. H, Para. H.4.2., Section H.4.2.1 referenced in this paragraph does not exist. Would the Government provide the content in this section?

Response: See Amended Solicitation. The words "in accordance with H.4.2.1." are deleted.

19. Pg. 127, Sec. M, Para. M.5.3, The evaluation criteria and solicitation section M.5.3 indicates that government desires larger more established companies for awards on the OASIS vehicles. This appears to be in conflict with FAR Part 19.202-1 which requires "Small business concerns shall be afforded an equitable opportunity to compete for all contracts that they can perform to the extent consistent with the Government's interest. When applicable, the contracting officer shall take the following actions: (b) Plan acquisitions such that, if practicable, more than one small business concern may perform the work,...". Could the Government adjust the evaluation criteria does not allow small business to form teams and equitably compete for an award under OASIS?

Response: The OASIS program is a family of contracts which includes a 100% set-aside contract called OASIS SB. We have also included lofty Small Business subcontracting goals on the OASIS contract. Accordingly, there is no conflict with FAR Part 19. Directly to your question about OASIS, the OASIS solicitation does allow for teams. Just like every Offeror on OASIS, however, the teams are required to have relevant experience as a bidding entity. The OASIS contracts are designed for complex requirements. Requiring Offerors (whether that is a team or not) to have relevant experience in order to perform these complex requirements is reasonable.

20. Pg. 109, Sec. L, Para. L.5.2.2, Would the Government confirm that Offerors are allowed to submit Provisional Rates to meet the "Approved Billing Rates" requirement?

Response: Approved billing rates are not a requirement, they are a scoring factor. Provisional rates, if approved, may be submitted.

21. Pg. 109, Sec. L, Para. L.5.2.2, Would the Government accept correspondence from DCAA acknowledging submittal Provisional Rates?

Response: The Government will accept correspondence from DCAA indicating approval to use Provisional Rates.

22. Pg. 109, Sec. L, Para. L.5.2.2, Per this section, Offerors are required to submit audit reports from DCMA, DCAA, or another CAF. If an Offeror's organization has not been audited due to backlog on behalf of DCAA, DCMA, or another CAF, would the Government accept correspondence from DCAA acknowledging submittal of Provisional Rates?

Response: See previous responses.

23. Pg. 90, Sec. L, Para. L.5.1.2., Paragraph number 4 in this directs Offerors to see Section L.5.3. for more details on the Past Performance rating, however, L.5.3 is about Relevant Experience. Should Offerors refer to Sections L.5.4 (Past Performance for Primary Projects) and M.5.2 (Evaluation Criteria for Past Performance Primary Projects) instead?

Response: This was addressed in Amendment 1.

24. Pg. 86, Sec. L, Proposal Format Table (L.5.1.2, L.5.3.1, & L.5.3.3), The Proposal Format Table mentions invoices and deliverables as part of the contract documentation, however in the corresponding instructions for sections L.5.1.2, L.5.3.1, & L.5.3.3, invoices and deliverables are not listed as required documentation. Would Government define in the specific sections the instructions for specific contract documentation acceptable for each requirement?

Response: Any official contract documentation necessary to validate requested information may be submitted. This varies from contract to contract and agency to agency, so more specific instruction is not really possible.

25. Pg. 90, Sec. L, Para. L.5.1.2.4, Are Offers required to submit PPIRs information for each Pool Qualification Project?

Response: Yes.

26. Pg. 89/112, Sec. L, Proposal Format Table (L.5.5.10) , The format described in this section implies that the Government would like Offerors to describe in our words our facility clearance. However, in section L.5.5.10 on page 112, it seems the Government would like Offerors to submit their Government-issued letter verifying the FCL. Would the Government please clarify how they would like Offeror to submit information for this section if claiming credit?

Response: Offerors only need to identify what kind of FCL they have in the Self Scoring Worksheet (Attachment J.5A) and Proposal Checklist (Attachment J.4) Nothing else is required.

27. Pg. 127, Sec. L, Para. M.5.3, Section M.1.4 referenced in this paragraph does not exists. Would the Government clarify to which section Offerors should reference?

Response: See Amended Solicitation. "(See Sections L.5.1.7. and M.1.4.)" are deleted.

28. Pg. 86, Sec. L, Para. L.4, For sections that have a page limit, will the Cover Page and Table of contents be outside of page count?

Response: A Table of Contents will be permitted. Cover pages are not required.

29. General, Can the government please provide its rationale for not structuring this acquisition so as to make it likely that small businesses can compete for the prime contract (IAW with FAR Part 19.2)? For example, the requirement to have multiple past performances in excess \$5 million per year in order to earn additional points (solicitation part M.6) biases the evaluation towards large businesses. Further, the statements in solicitation part 19.5.3 clearly indicate that large businesses are more desirable and will receive a more favorable evaluation than small business.

Response: See response to previous, similar question.

30. In instances where the contract start and end dates are incorrect and/or contract dollar value is incorrect in the FPDS-NG system, what would the Government suggest Offerors submit as the authoritative documentation?

Response: The contract documents should have all of this information.

31. L.5.1.2: If a referenced contract does not specify a NAICS code, will the Government accept wording in a solicitation or award document that clearly and unambiguously matches a NAICS code?

Response: No.

32. L.5.1.2: For a referenced contract, if the FPDS report, solicitation, or award document does not specify the NAICS code, will the Government accept a letter from the contracting officer or organization that provides the correct code (as is allowed when an incorrect code is given)?

Response: We will accept a letter from the contracting officer, but nobody else.

33. C.2.2.4. Engineering Services

Definition: Engineering Services includes any service or creative work, the adequate performance of which requires education, training and experience in the application of special knowledge in consulting, investigating, evaluating, planning and designing, engineering principles. Engineering Services covered by the Brooks Architect-Engineers Act (40 U.S.C. 1102) are not covered by the primary scope of OASIS SB.

Should we be submitting for architectural work through OASIS?

Response: No, architectural work will not be performed on OASIS. Thanks for checking with us though.

34. Reference Page 102, Section L.5.3.1, Pass/Fail Requirements for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects:

Paragraph 2 of section L.5.3.1. requires that the Offerors have 5 relevant projects that have been completed within the last five (5) years prior to the solicitation closing date; or be ongoing with at least one (1) year of performance completed prior to the solicitation closing date. This provision also states that a project may be ongoing for less than a year provided that a performance assessment report has been completed, which is rarely the case prior to the completion of a year of performance.

With the current solicitation closing date being September 17, 2013, this provision currently precludes an offeror from including any FY12 contract awards that occurred at the end of the last fiscal year between 9/18/12 and 9/30/12.

It is respectfully requested that the government amend this provision to permit past performance experience for contracts awarded prior to October 1, 2012, or that the due date of the proposals and solicitation closing date be extended to September 30, 2013, to allow offerors to include current and relevant contracts that were awarded prior to the end of government FY12.

An expedited response to this question would be appreciated, as the response is relevant to an offerors bid decision on this procurement.

Response: See Amended Solicitation. We will allow first year projects that end Sept 30 to be submitted as relevant experience projects.

35. In reviewing the responses to question included in Amendment no. 1, it appears that our question below was not specifically answered by the government. Please provide a response.

Also, responses 128 and 129 in Amendment no. 1 indicates that Subcontracts will not be considered for the purposes of meeting the Pass/Fail requirements specified in section L.5.3.1.

Prior to reviewing this clarification in Amendment no. 1, this offeror intended to include a project that was awarded as a subcontract by SAIC-Frederick. SAIC-Frederick operates the Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research's Federally Funded Research and Development Center, a national laboratory dedicated to cancer and AIDS research. This is the only national lab within the Department of Health and Human Services. For the purpose of qualifying under section L.5.3.1, would this subcontract be considered by the government?

Response: No, we do not allow any subcontracts to be qualify as relevant experience projects. This has not changed from the draft solicitations.

36. We have a GSA consolidated contract, GS-00F-0002W with SINs for IT, Financial Services and Environmental support.
We have seen the solicitation for the OASIS contract and are unsure if we might benefit by submitting for it versus just keeping our consolidated contract.
Could you help us understand the difference(s) between the two contracts so we may better determine our steps forward?

Response: We really can't advise what is best for your company. OASIS would allow your company to do cost reimbursement work and non-commercial work, which schedules do not allow. OASIS also makes the inclusion of things like ODCs much easier to incorporate.

37. Does L.5.1.2 supersede the number of required past performances? That is, how many past performances are required for Section L.5.3.?

Response: No. Pool Qualification and Relevant Experience are separate and distinct sections of the solicitation. L.5.3 requires 5 projects.

38. Amendment 1 has changed Section L.5.1.2 to read for an offeror to be eligible for consideration under a given pool, the offeror shall have performed three (3) qualified projects

The original SB solicitation read two (2). SB was also two (2) versus unrestricted requiring three (3).

Is this a typo or has amendment 1 changed the requirement for SB to three (3)

Contractor requests the requirement stay as two especially this late in the RFP response activities since it will restrict competition for the number of qualified bidders in the effected Pool. Your prompt response is appreciated.

Response: The typo was corrected in Amendment 2. The correct number is 2.

39. The file naming conventions for documentation of NAICS letters, Novation agreements, and change of name documentation does not appear to allow the files to be directly associated with a specific project. While there will presumably be at most one NAICS letter for each project, there may be multiple Novation and Contract name change documents for each project. We suggest that these file names conform to the model defined for Pool Qualification Documents, i.e.:
ABC.VOL1.PQ.CD.P1.P1.NAICSLTR.pdf
ABC.VOL1.PQ.CD.P1.P1.NOV1.pdf
ABC.VOL1.PQ.CD.P1.P1.NOV2.pdf

We observe a similar naming convention issue with Prime Projects in Volume 3 and potentially Secondary Projects, also in Volume 3.

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

40. Proposal Format Table: Volume 2, L.5.2.1 We believe that the supplemental documents (ABC.VOL2.FRSUP1.pdf, etc) currently listed under L.5.2.2 should be listed under L.5.2.1

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

41. To avoid a duplicate filename with the filename required for L.5.2.1, we suggest that the file name for L.5.2.2 be that as shown in the Original RFP: ABC.VOL2.RC.pdf.

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

42. Proposal Format Table: Volume 3, L.5.3.1 through L.5.3.2.8 The third column, "Format or Template" now calls out "Past Performance validation (PPIRS/CPARS, Award Fee Determinations, or Past Performance Surveys)". This seems to be a duplication of the information required in Volume 4 for Primary Projects. Is the information required in both volumes?

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

43. Proposal Format Table: Volume 4, L.5.4.1 through L.5.4.3 Given that we are only to submit 1 past performance document per primary project, should the filenames correspond to the project number? Example, if Project 1 and Project 3 have CPARS documents, Project 2 and Project 5 an Award Fee Document, and Project 4 a Past Performance rating form should these files be named ABC.VOL4. PPIRS1.pdf, ABC.VOL4.AFD2, ABC.VOL4.PPIRS3.pdf, ABC.VOL4.PPR4.pdf and ABC.VOL4.AFD5? Please clarify.

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

44. To avoid a duplicate filename with the filename required for L.5.5.3, we suggest that the file name for L.5.5.4 be ABC.VOL5.AESref.pdf.

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

45. For consistency with other documents in this Volume, we suggest that file ABC.VOL5.AS9100poc.pdf be changed to ABC.VOL5.AS9100ref.pdf

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

46. Proposal Format Table: Volume 5, L.5.5.10 Please confirm that a file is or is not required, answer to question # 62s indicate that checking the appropriate block on the self-scoring checklist is sufficient.

Response: Confirmed.

47. Past Performance now requires a list of past performance file names for both Pool Qualification and Prime Projects. Please confirm that the actual files documenting Pool Qualification Project past performance are only to be submitted in Volume 1.

Response: See Revised Section L.4. in the amended solicitation.

48. Section L.5.4, Volume 4, Past Performance, Page 116

Amendment No 01 to the OASIS SB RFP made a significant change to the past performance "source" requirements for task order projects submitted for any of the Pool Qualification Projects or Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects. Specifically, page 116 now states (font format is as shown in the RFP) -

CAUTION: NO MULTIPLE AWARD IDIQ/BPA shall be used at the master contract level for past performance under any circumstances for any project.

Many agencies will not provide individual past performance evaluations, regardless of whether it is a CPARS or Past Performance Rating Form (i.e. Attachment D), for individual task orders under an IDIQ. This is the case with our Wright-Patterson Air Force Base customer on a contract that was completed two years ago, well within the limits as stated in Section L.5.2.1, paragraph 2. Requiring us to replace our existing IDIQ-level CPARS with task order-level Past Performance Rating Forms is also not an option because the program is no longer in existence and all past government employees are no longer willing to provide evaluations. They have told us that we must use our existing CPARS.

This new Volume 4 requirement makes us non-compliant due to circumstances out of our control. As this is a new requirement imposed without discussions or warning, after a considerable amount of time was invested by us (and others) in the pursuit of OASIS SB, we ask that you remove this requirement and allow IDIQ-level CPARS for task order-level projects.

Response: If the base Multiple Award IDIQ/BPA Past Performance directly covers the Past Performance of the task orders as in your situation we will allow it. We deleted that statement in the amended solicitation.

49. Since Amendment 1 was a complete conforming re-do of the solicitation, including all attachments, I guess I was anticipating based on initial read of Q&A 63 that Block 19 on SF33 was in error. I think I now see that L.5.1.1 instruction referring to SF33 Block 19 was where the clarification was made. So, Amendment 1 is a complete re-do of original RFP except for SF33, and industry should use original RFP SF33, correct?

Response: A revised SF 33 will be provided in the most current Amended. Use that one.

50. Q. Please clarify that the FCL document listed in the Proposal Format Table located on page 92 of Amendment 01, Volume 5, Section L.5.5.10 is not required.

Response: That is correct. All that is required is to indicate FCL level in the proposal checklist and self-scoring worksheet.

51. In regards to the past performance rating form under OASIS-SB, you have added Paragraph 6. Utilization of Small Business, yet the SF30 Amendment states there was no change to this attachment. Do you want our customer to rate us in this area?

Response: No. Small businesses should not be rated on Utilization of Small Business. That paragraph was accidentally copied over from the OASIS form. We deleted the paragraph in the recent amendment.

52. Can the two (2) pool qualification projects consist of a completed contract and a follow-on contract for requirements of comparable complexity if each meets the requirements specified in L.5.3?

Response: Yes.

53. Can the Government consider any leniency to the application of the pool qualification standards described in L.5.3 to enable otherwise qualified small businesses to compete in pools applicable to their size and expertise? Specifically, can the Government consider only requiring one pool qualification project that meets all applicable standards in L.5.3 and one additional project associated with that NAICS code?

Response: L.5.3 refers to Relevant Experience Projects. L.5.1.2 refers to Pool Qualification Projects. Pool Qualification projects are not subject to the requirements of L.5.3.

54. **RFP Reference Page 102, Section L.5.3.1 – Paragraph 3. :** *No individual Annual Project Value shall be less than \$750,000 per year.* and,

Reference RFP Page 126, Section M.6 SCORING TABLE, Self-Scoring Worksheet for Proposal Submission, L.5.3.2.2 Individual Project Value: *Is EACH Project \$2M OR MORE on an annual basis*

QUESTION: With a pass-fail criterion of a minimum Annual Project Value of \$750,000 or more and a self-scoring element of points available only for projects with an annual value of \$2M or more, are offerors to assume that no evaluation points will be given for cited projects with an Annual Project Value of between \$750,000 and \$1.99M?

Response: That is correct.

55. **RFP Reference Page 89, Section L.4 Proposal Format Table, Volume 4, L.5.4.4, Meeting or Exceeding Small Business Goals:** *Copy of ISR/SF 294 reports or SSR/SF 295 reports as applicable*

If an offeror's cited contract does not require submitting ISR / SF 294 or SSR / SF 295 reports, may offerors include as part of OASIS proposal documentation the completed small business utilization reports required by the specific cited contract?

Response: No.

56. **RFP Reference Page 84, Section L.3 Proposal Instructions, 5th paragraph**

With regard to formatting each proposal page, when using templates/formats provided, is it permitted to put our standard company non-disclosure statement in the footer, or some other "protective" marking to denote the intent that it be used only in reference to this proposal? Also, is it permitted to put a company identifier/date/RFP #/ et cetera in the header?

(Our concern is without these identification markings, should any part of the proposal be printed during the evaluation process, there is nothing to identify the data with a particular offeror.)

Response: We have allowed for such markings in Amendment 1.

57. **RFP Reference Page 112, Section L.6 Volume 6 – COST PRICE, second paragraph,** "The ceiling rates are to be based upon the highest qualified employee within a given labor category or group..."

Since many small businesses may not have employees in all 104 labor categories, may offerors use generally accepted direct labor research data such as Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), or the table found in the RFP at Section J.2, Attachment (2) – DIRECT LABOR RATE RANGES to help establish ceiling rates?

Response: Yes.

58. **SF_30-AMENDMENT_01-OASIS_SB_SOLICITATION_GS00Q-13-DR-0002 Page 2 AMENDMENT 01 SUMMARY OF CHANGES** SF 33 states "Block 9 of the SF 33 is revised to read "Sealed Offerors in original and 0 copies". Does the Government intend to issue an updated SF 33 with the above change?

Response: Yes, See updated form in this amendment.

59. The Response to Question 62 states “We have removed the file for FCL. Offerors need only identify the FCL in the self-scoring worksheet.” However Amendment 01 Section L.4 Proposal Format, Proposal Format Table item L.5.5.10 under column header “Format or Template” states “Offerors description of the type of FCL” and under column header “Page Limit” states “Not to exceed 1 page.” Please clarify as to whether Offeror should provide substantiation for facility security clearance level in the OASIS SB proposal.

Response: See amended solicitation. Offerors only need to identify what kind of FCL they have in the Self Scoring Worksheet (Attachment J.5A) and Proposal Checklist (Attachment J.4) Nothing else is required.

60. Section L.5.3.3.2, Page 107, Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders outlines the following additional points:
Two (2) Multiple Award Contracts with at least Four (4) total Task Order awards. Additionally, at least Two (2) Task Orders must have been awarded under any given Multiple Award Contract.
Five (5) Multiple Award Contracts with at least Ten (10) total Task Order awards. Additionally, at least Two (2) Task Orders must have been awarded under any given Multiple Award Contract.
Ten (10) Multiple Award Contracts with at least Twenty (20) total Task Order awards. Additionally, at least Two (2) Task Orders must have been awarded under any given Multiple Award Contract.
However, Section M.5.1.11 Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders outlines different requirements to obtain additional points:
Two (2) Multiple Award Contracts with at least **Ten (10) total Task Order awards**. Additionally, at least **Three (3) Task Orders** must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts. For example, Multiple Award Contract #1 has the minimum Three (3) Task Order awards and Multiple Award Contract #2 has the Seven (7) additional Task Order awards to qualify for at least Ten (10) total Task Order awards.
Five (5) Multiple Award Contracts with at least **Twenty Five (25) total Task Order awards**. Additionally, at least **Three (3) Task Orders** must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts
Ten (10) Multiple Award Contracts with at least **Fifty (50) total Task Order awards**. Additionally, at least **Three (3) Task Orders** must have been awarded under each of the Multiple Award Contracts

Response: Section L is correct for the SB solicitation. Section M is incorrect and was an inadvertent carryover from the OASIS solicitation. We amended the solicitation to fix this. Thank you for bringing it to our attention.

61. Thank you for your prompt responses to our questions. We are very curious to know if you believe there is a chance for an extension on the OASIS SB proposal. This is a very complicated proposal, especially for small businesses. We know how hard you worked on getting the RFP right; we were following the process from the beginning. However, we are of the opinion that many quality companies will end up being excluded due to the inability to pull together the myriad documents in time for the current proposal due date. We are working feverishly and hope that we can get everything together, but frankly, we're worried. Is there any insight you can provide with regard to the due date?

Response: At the moment, we are not planning to extend the proposal due date. There are a number of issues at play here that affect whether an extension will be granted. We should know more by the end of the week and will update accordingly. For now, please continue as though the due date will not be extended. We appreciate the honest feedback and thanks for being engaged with us through the process.

62. With respect to CPAR information for Relevant Experience projects, we have projects that have been completed with less than one year of performance (and exceed \$750K). The government has not completed a CPAR on these projects yet, but has completed the J.8 Attachment 8 for us to use. Can we use these projects for Relevant Experience?

Response: If the project is complete, then yes, the project is eligible to be used as a relevant experience project and you may have a past performance survey completed.

63. Please confirm that we may reference the entire duration of a project for which we acquired the entire company and the predecessor company ("transferor") no longer exists. The contracts we are referencing have been performed continuously by the same staff before, during, and after the merger/acquisition and the entire duration of the contract reflects the combined capacity of our company that is bidding on GSA OASIS.

Response: Confirmed.

64. For ISO certifications, L.5.5.5-L.5.5.9 requires verification document to include a copy of the Offeror's official audit report from approved ISO certification body. However, L.4 (page 92) Proposal Format asks for a Copy of Verification/approval (limited to verification requirement) and the J.4 Attachment Proposal Checklist requires only "POC information, copy of Certification Body Certificate, Page Numbers, Paragraph numbers to validate." Would the government amend the RFP L.5.5.5-L.5.5.9 and L.4 areas of the proposal to list the same submission requirements as listed in the J.4 Attachment?

Response: Yes. See amended solicitation.

65. L.4 Proposal Format shows the file name for reference documentation for the Approved Estimating System's as ABC.VOL5.EVMSref.pdf. Can the Government confirm that the file name should be ABC.VOL5.AESref.pdf instead.

Response: See Revised Table in the amended solicitation.

66. Can Government confirm that all file name attachments listed under 5.2.2 in the L.4 Proposal Format actually belong in 5.2.1 in the L.4 Proposal Format Table?

Response: See Revised Table in the amended solicitation.

67. L.4 Proposal Format shows the file name for Reps & Certs as ABC.VOL2.527.pdf. Can the Government confirm that the file name should be ABC.VOL2RC.pdf instead?

Response: See Revised Table in the amended solicitation

68. Can Government delete the requirement for CPARS submissions for Relevant Experience projects in this section as it is a duplicate submission from the same requirement in L.5.4.1?

Response: Yes.

69. The J.4 Attachment, Volume 4 Past Performance: Do you want Offeror's to list the CPAR file name for the Pool Qualifications Project as required in L.5.4.1 Amendment?

Response: Yes.

70. J.4 Volume 3, Question #2 asks Offerors to Attach J.10. Can Government confirm that the attachment should be Attachment J.8, not J.10?

Response: J.4., Volume 3, Question 2, is about Secondary Projects which is Attachment J.10.

71. J.4 Volume 6, Question #1 asks Offerors to Attach J.7 template. Can Government confirm that the attachment should be Attachment J.9, not J.7?

Response: Yes. See amended J.7.

72. **Section L.5.3.2.1, Relevant Experience (Primary) Project under an OASIS SB NAICS Code, page 109, paragraph 2.** It states that: "If one out of the five required relevant experience primary projects is a collection of task orders placed under a Single-Award IDIQ task order contract...the NAICS code will be determined at the master IDIQ/BPA level." There is an FPDS report indicating the NAICS code for one of the TO's under our single-award IDIQ Relevant Experience Primary Project. However, there is not an FPDS Report at the master contract level. Is the FPDS Report for the TO (which is the same across the master contract) sufficient evidence to demonstrate the NAICS code for this Relevant Experience Primary Project?

Response: Yes.

73. **Section L.5.4.1, Past Performance (PPIRS Information Exists), [page 116, paragraph 1.** It states that: "If a final rating is not available, the most current interim past performance information will be used." One of our Relevant Experience Primary Projects has a PPIRS/CPARS past performance interim report, but it's dated May 2012 (which could arguably be considered not current). In this situation, should we use the PPIRS/CPARS report or do a Past Performance customer survey?

Response: Use the Interim report.

74. **Section L.5.3.2, Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contract/BPAs and Task Orders, pages 113- 114 and Section M.5.1.11, Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contract/BPAs and Task Orders, page 131.** Please clarify whether there must be at least 2 or at least 3 task orders awarded under each of the multiple award contracts to receive credit for a Multiple Award Contract Relevant Experience Secondary Project. The above referenced sections contradict each other.

Response: See amended solicitation. The correct number is two.

75. **Section J.7, Attachment 7, Page 3, Number 3.** The instructions require Offerors to explain the rationale supporting assertions that the indicated Core Disciplines were performed under the Relevant Experience Primary Project. It also notes that: "Offeror must provide excerpts of contract documentation that substantiate the core disciplines performed in Volume 3 of the proposal submission." In the text box provided, do we provide the references to the contract documentation that validate the performance of the core discipline, or do we provide a high level overview of the work performed that reflects the Core Discipline - meaning GSA independently reviews the contract documentation for the highlighted elements?

Response: At a minimum, you need to provide the references to the contract documentation that validate the performance of the core discipline. We allow a description to be provided that could be used to provide a high level overview of the work performed that reflects the Core Discipline.

76. When the task order award references the base period AND option periods, are we to submit the corresponding task order modifications to validate that the PoP falls within 5 years of the solicitation closing date?

Response: Any documentation that validates that information may be provided. That may be a mod, and FPDS report, or any other official form of documentation.

77. Section L.5.3.1(2) Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects. The RFP states that each project must have been completed within the past Five (5) years prior to the solicitation closing date; or, be ongoing with at least One (1) year of performance completed prior to the solicitation closing date. What is not clear is whether a closed project must have at least One (1) year of performance completed prior to the solicitation closing date.

Response: If a project is complete, the period of performance is less than one year, and the project meets all other requirements, it may be used.

78. The FBO notice published on August 23rd indicates that there was an Amendment 2, but the attachments all read Amendment 1. Can you confirm that there is only one Amendment for the Unrestricted Suite?

Response: Including the current Amendment issued August 30th, OASIS SB currently has 3 amendments, and OASIS has only 2 amendments. The folder locations in FBO is incorrect on OASIS side. For OASIS go by the amendment number in the document headers, not the folder locations.

79. Section M.5.1.2. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Value, 1st Paragraph and Line #1: "For each relevant experience (primary) project submitted, using the same average annual value calculation methods in Section L.5.3.1., the Offeror will receive additional points in accordance with Section M.6., Scoring Table. if the annual value meets or exceeds the following: 1. Project averages greater than \$3 Million on an annual basis but, less than \$4 Million on an annual basis, including options." The Section M.6 Scoring Table on indicates a scoring range for a "Project valued at \$2 Million or more on an annual basis but, less than \$4 Million on an annual basis, including options". Please clarify whether the correct range is \$2-4M, or \$3-4M.

Response: The correct range is \$2-\$4 Million. We have corrected this in Amendment 01. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

This error/discrepancy in the RFP has caused significant harm to Small Businesses such as ourselves. The original wording in the OASIS SB RFP issued on July 31, 2013 regarding project size for additional points, Section M.5.1.2, read "greater than \$3 Million but less than \$4M", which was different than what had appeared in the draft RFP. Upon seeing the \$3M figure, which we believed was the new, correct figure - and which is obviously more difficult for small businesses to attain on a yearly basis - we felt it necessary to reconsider whether or not to submit. On August 23, 2013 (more than three weeks after the release of the final RFP), in Amendment 01, GSA changed the figure in Section M back to \$2M. As a result we (and other Small Businesses who had relied on the Section M wording in the RFP) lost 23 days of potential proposal development time due to this significant error/discrepancy. Section M carries more weight than other sections because it is where the evaluation process is spelled out. While there may be typographical errors in other areas of the RFP, Section M is the evaluation bible and Offerors are entitled to rely on the numbers presented therein to fully reflect the RFP's intent, and to base their bid/no bid decisions on that information.

In the interests of fair competition, we strongly urge GSA to grant a three week extension to allow firms who relied on the faulty information in the final RFP to have a fair and reasonable opportunity to recover and complete their proposals.

Response: Thank you for the recommendation we will take it under consideration.

80. For the purposes of qualifying to bid, as required by Section L.5.1.2, is Freddie Mac considered to be a federal agency?

Response: Freddie Mac is listed as The Federal Home Mortgage Corporation and is a federal entity. If all other qualifiers in L.5.1.2. are present it may.

81. question in response to Solicitation No. GS00Q-13-DR-0001.

Page 89, Volume 2, File Naming Convention for Reps and Certs reads:
ABC.VOL2.527.pdf
ABC.VOL2.FRSUP1.pdf
(Volume 2, Financial Resources Support Document 1)
ABC.VOL2.FRSUP2.pdf
Etc.

Should this read?
ABC.VOL2.RC

Response: See Revised Table in amended solicitation.

82. Given the on-going protests of the OASIS procurement, we will be required to adjust our resource allocation for the bid if the timetable changes. Does the Government expect for there to be a change in the due date?

Response: We do not anticipate an adjustment to the due date as a result of the protests. If any adjustment is necessary, we will post that to FBO immediately.

83. Previously Answered in Amendment 1 - 104. Question: Section L.5.1.2, can a single contract or task order (i.e., project) be used to satisfy more than one Pool Qualification? For instance, if a contract or task order under NAICS 541712 shows applicability to both Research and Development in Aircraft (Exception A) and Research and Development in Guided Missiles (Exception C), could that contract or task order be used as a pool qualification project for both Pool 6 and Pool 5B - if the Offeror submits evidence (i.e. SOW) that supports work performed in both Pools?

Response: Yes.

Follow Up Question: Please confirm that regardless of the size standard (i.e. 1000 vs. 1500) in which the contract was competed and regardless of whether or not they were competed as a "small business set-aside" or "full and open" that this still holds true.

Response: Confirmed.

84. For example, we have 3 contracts that were competed as small business set-asides under 541712 with the 1000 employee size standard. No exceptions were specifically identified in Section K or any other section in the RFP, and our award letters also do not specify any of the exceptions. Each contract has within the SOW's scope a description of requirements relevant to Exceptions A, B and C. Will having these contracts qualify us for Pools 4, 5A, 5B, and 6 in the SB and Unrestricted solicitations?

Response: If the SOWs indicate what you claim that they indicate, then yes.

85. In which Volume folder on the DVD+R should the past performance files for the Pool Qualification Projects go and where should they be listed in Attachment 4 – Proposal Checklist? In Amendment 1, the L.4 Table is unchanged in that the Pool Qualification Project past performance files are listed under Volume 1 and the Relevancy Project past performance files are listed under Volume 4. The revised Attachment 4 – Proposal Checklist Volume 1 item #2 suggests that the Pool Qualification Project past performance files should be listed there, but Volume 4 items #1, #2, and #3 suggest that Pool Qualifications Project past performance files should also be listed there.

Response: Past Performance for both Pool Qualification and Relevant Experience should be listed in Volume 4.

86. Revised RFP L.4.: The file names listed for L.5.2.2 Representations and Certifications appear to be the revised file names that should actually be listed for L.5.2.1 Financial Resources. Please confirm. If this is correct, should Offerors keep the ABC.VOL2.RC.pdf file name for Representations and Certifications?

Response: See Revised L.4. Table in the amendment to the solicitation.

87. Amendment 1, Q&A #62 states that the Government removed the file for FCL from Attachment 4 – Proposal Checklist and that Offerors only need to identify the FCL in the self-scoring checklist. However, this file is still shown as required in the revised RFP in L.4. table, L.5.5.10 requirements, and is still asked for in Attachment 4. Please clarify.

Response: No file submission is required. See Amendment to the solicitation.

88. How can we confirm that our proposal has been received if submitting via Fedex service? Is there someone we can contact via telephone or email to confirm that our proposal has been received?

Response: We are under the impression that Fedex offers delivery confirmation or some kind of service like that. Is that incorrect?

89. Question 1.) The Solicitation states, "However, one (1) out of the five (5) required relevant experience projects may be a collection of task orders placed under a Single-Award IDIQ task order contract or Single-Award BPA. A „collection of task orders“ shall not exceed a total of 6 task orders." Since in the past the Government has rarely awarded Single-Award IDIQ task order contracts for every type of professional service in the subject solicitation to large businesses, can the Government please change this requirement from one (1) out of the five (5) required relevant experience projects may be a collection of task orders to all five (5) of the projects may be a collection of task orders placed under a Multiple-Award IDIQ task order contract?

Response: No. We are sorry, but multiple award contracts are a completely different animal than single-award or stand-alone contracts.

90. Question 2.) The Solicitation states, "The combined annual value of the Five (5) projects must be equal to or greater than \$25 Million per year. No Individual Annual Project Value shall be less than \$3 Million per year." Since in the past the Government has rarely awarded task orders for every type of professional service in the subject solicitation that was greater than \$3 Million to large businesses, can the Government please change this individual annual project value from "No Individual Annual Project shall be less than \$3 Million per year" to No Individual Annual Project shall be less than \$500 Thousand per year?

Response: No. Given the robust amount of competition we anticipate on OASIS, we don't feel that lowering the standards will result in any changes in the eventual awardees.

91. With respect to the solicitation requirements regarding Joint Venture (JV) experience, we understand the general requirements regarding JVs. Still, we are not clear on the solicitation requirements vis-à-vis SBA-approved 8(a) Mentor-Protégé (MP) Agreements when such an 8(a) MP team presents as a qualified 8(a) JV where the protégé is Managing Partner and is at least a 51% owner of the JV. Thus, we request clarification for this limited situation.

IEA is an 8(a) firm that is in an SBA-approved MP relationship with a leading A/E/P firm mentor, MWH Americas, and we are, together, prepared to present as a qualified 8(a) Joint Venture (JV) in the OASIS program. The program is intended to promote qualified teams and thereby assist in the development of qualified protégé by allowing special consideration in competition. Our concern is that this solicitation does not appear to embrace these unique requirements of the SBA 8(a) MP program for qualified SBA-approved 8(a) JVs.

As regards the special category of SBA-approved 8(a) JVs within the SBA 8(a) MP program, and pursuant to 13 CFR 124.520 and related regulations, we want to confirm that GSA will allow our JV, as such an SBA-approved 8(a) MP JV, to present within this OASIS solicitation. Further, we want to confirm that GSA will our SBA-approved 8(a) MP JV to present projects that are either the sole or shared experience of either or both partners.

If either or both of these considerations are not allowed for SBA-approved 8(a) MP JVs, please explain how this solicitation conforms to FAR requirements regarding such SBA-approved 8(a) MP JVs, and, if not allowed, please also explain whether and the conditions under which solicitation Section H.3.1 on page 43 of 128 may be used by GSA to make a direct award to such an SBA-approved 8(a) MP JV, if GSA intends that the solicitation will not allow consideration of individual JV partner experience under these circumstances.

Response: The OASIS SB solicitation is open to all Offerors who meet the pass/fail requirements. There is no prohibition on JVs or any other kind of business. We simply require all Offerors to have the required experience levels.

92. In the M.6 Scoring Table, VOL 3, L.5.3.2.1 section it limits credit for NAICS codes to H.4.2.1 table. however L.5.1.2 states "

Note: In addition, for Pools 4, 5A, 5B, and/or 6 specifically, if any of the Three (3) projects were assigned the 2002 predecessor NAICS Code of 541710, this is also an acceptable NAICS Code."

Can the Govt please add NAICS 541710 to the H.4.2 table to validate the points scored in the M.6 Table.

Response: Section H applies to OASIS task orders after award. The scoring of points for NAICS/PSC codes is identified in Section L.5.1.2, which includes 541710. No change is required.

93. If a Relevant Experience Project was awarded under 541710, can the offeror claim the 150 points associated with the first scoring row (L.5.3.2.1) in Section M.6 ?

Response: Yes.

94. (L.5.3.1., Page 108): We are unclear as to how the government wants us to calculate the cumulative value for Project 5, for the case when it is a collection of task orders (TOs). Unfortunately, the guidance in RFP sections L.5.3.1, L.5.3.2, and associated Attachment J-7 is subject to various interpretations. Please clarify which if any of the following three calculation methods is correct:

(1) Calculate the annual obligated or estimated value of each TO, **needed to score maximum points on project size**, and add these to get the cumulative value as shown in Section L.5.3.1 example, even though this section concerns minimum threshold values.

(2) Calculate the total obligated or estimated dollars for each TO, **needed to score maximum points on project size**, and divide the total by the period of performance of the single award IDIQ/BPA, as suggested by Question 8 of Project 5 Alternate-Background Information as well as Question 2 of Scoring Related Information (What is annual dollar value per year of all TOs placed under the IDIQ/BPA?).

(3) Same as Method (2) above, except divide the total dollars by the period or performance for the selected TOs.

Our suggestion is to use Method (3) above as being most representative of the ability/capacity of a potential OASIS contractor to perform on larger, integrations projects. Note that the number of TOs **needed to score maximum points on project size** will be different for the three Methods listed above.

Response:

For a collection of task orders, add up the obligated or estimated value of **every** task order awarded under the IDIQ (not just the task orders used for identifying relevant experience and past performance) and then divide the total by total number of months awarded or factored into the value. For example:

The IDIQ has 10 task orders placed under it

Task Order 1: \$1,000,000 January 2010 - December 2010

Task Order 2: \$250,000 March 2010 - December 2010

Task Order 3: \$750,000 June 2010 - May 2011

Task Order 4: \$1,500,000 August 2010 - July 2011

Task Order 5: \$500,000 November 2010 - October 2011

Task Order 6: \$800,000 January 2011 - December 2011

Task Order 7: \$200,000 March 2011 - February 2012

Task Order 8: \$3,000,000 January 2012 - December 2012

Task Order 9: \$1,500,000 August 2012 - July 2013

Task Order 10: \$500,000 January 2013 - December 2013

The total, cumulative estimated value of the 10 task orders is \$10,000,000

The total, cumulative period of performance began at Task order 1 in January 2010 and goes through December 2013. This equals 36 months. So, \$10,000,000 divided by 36 months multiplied by 12 yields an average annual value of \$3,333,333.33.

We hope this helps and thanks for the question.

95. Please indicate whether the SF30 accompanying Amendment 02 should be signed by the Contractor and if so, how many copies should be returned.

Response: No. All Offerors must acknowledge receipt of the amendment by inserting Amendment Numbers and dates in Block 14 of the original SF 33 with your proposal submission.

96. If we have a Past Performance Rating form completed at the IDIQ level, do we need individual Rating forms completed for each of the six (6) individual TOs under the IDIQ as well?

Response: So long as the rating form at the IDIQ level includes rating performance of task orders, then no, the IDIQ level rating will suffice. However, if the IDIQ rating does not rate task order performance, then surveys must be obtained.

97. Please specify what documentation you require in order to verify the work performed? Do you require invoices for the work in addition to the award documentation?

Response: All we need is documentation sufficient to validate whatever claims are being made. Whatever contract documents provide that validation may be submitted.

98. At many Federal facilities, mail is routed first to a remote mail facility for screening. This would require offerors to build in extra days for delivery. Please advise whether this is the case at the GSA Ft. Worth office.

Response: Incoming mail to the federal facility in Fort Worth is subject to a screening process, but it is on site.

99. Please confirm that we must provide documentation to verify our FCL. We do not understand the Government's response that 'we have removed the file for FCL'.

Response: You do not have to provide documentation of your FCL. We will verify that data through a Government database.

100. If there is a CPAR available for a contract without a full year of performance (i.e., full year of performance occurs two weeks after OASIS SB Proposal Submittal date), may we still use it as one of our primary projects?

Response: If the project meets the one year requirement by the end of September 2013, we will allow it.

101. Question: A total of 7 separate MA-IDIQ task order contracts (Pools) will result from this solicitation. One SF 33 is required to be completed for this submission. Each amendment to the solicitation must be acknowledged with each amendment number and date in Block 14 of the SF 33. In the event a company is awarded a contract in each of the 7 pools, will there be 7 separate contract numbers, with 7 SF 33 documents?

Response: Yes. We may be using the SF 26 for award documents.

102. Question: For Pool 3, Pool 5A, Pool 5B, and Pool 6, will the Government accept an FPDS print-out showing the NAICS and the Product/Service Code (PSC) specific to the exception? We believe the PSC can adequately and objectively document the NAICS exception.

Response: Yes.

103. Question: The RFP states: "If the Offeror is applying for Pool 3 in addition to Pool 1 and has provided Pool Qualification projects for Pool 3, projects for Pool 1 qualification are not required to be submitted" (page 91) and "To be eligible to compete for a Pool 3, the Offeror must identify any Three (3) projects that has NAICS Code 541330 assigned to it and verification documentation for any of the Exceptions on each project." Will the government confirm that it will evaluate submitted projects to assess eligibility for Pool 1 even if the government determines that the projects do not establish eligibility for Pool 3? Will the government similarly confirm this approach for Pool 5A, Pool 5B and/or Pool 6 as to qualifying for Pool 4?

Response: We take your question to mean that if an Offeror applies for Pool 3, but one of the projects does not meet the exception, will the evaluation team still use those projects for Pool 1 application. The answer is yes.

104. Question: Do the projects identified as the Pool Qualification Projects need to match those called for in J.5(A) and J.7?

Response: No.

105. Question: Like many companies, we authorize only certain individuals to sign on behalf of our corporation. Would GSA please change the requirement in the second paragraph from "... must be signed by the individual responsible for the design of the Offeror's Accounting System" to "... must be signed by an authorized representative for the company."

Response: This is a DCAA requirement and will not change.

106. Question: The RFP states: "Department of Defense (DD) 1155 – Order for Supplies or Services (Block 9 identifies the Prime Contractor, Block 6 identifies the U.S. Federal Government Agency, and Block 16 identifies the date the Contracting Officer awarded/signed)." Our interpretation of this form is that Block 16 contains the date that the Contractor signed the form (not the Contracting Officer). Our interpretation is that Block 24 contains the date of the Contracting Officer's signature and Block 3 contains the effective date of the contract. Will GSA please update this sentence as appropriate?

Response: It is corrected in the Amendment

107. Question: Will the government provide instructions in paragraph L.5.4.4 for Meeting or Exceeding SB goals or is this a requirement only for the unrestricted track?

Response: This only applies to the OASIS full and open solicitation.

108. Question: On some of our contracts, the Government completes Form C7051 (rev Feb 2005) NSN: 7540-FM-001-5542 Contractor Performance Evaluation Assessment (T&M/Labor Hour Contracts) which has rating categories of Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal and Unsatisfactory. Will the government accept this form as an acceptable past performance rating form?

Response: Yes.

109. Question: If additional labor categories and their associate ceiling rates are added via bi-lateral modifications, Will the government make these added categories available to all OASIS contractors at the same time?

Response: Yes.

110. Question: Does the government anticipate any affect to the acquisition milestone schedule and RFP due date for OASIS (the full and open competition) resulting from the recent pre-award protests which have been filed?

Response: No. We accounted for protests in the milestone schedule. Additionally, we anticipate no extension to the proposal due date.

111. Question: If we do not need to submit a subcontracting plan, do we create a file that has the single line in it (named 'ABC.VOL1.SP.PDF') stating that we aren't preparing a Subcontracting Plan?

Response: No. Simply do not submit one.

112. Question: If we do not need to submit a MRCL, do we create a file that has the single line in it (named 'ABC.VOL1.MRCL.PDF') stating that we aren't providing any MRCLs?

Response: No. Simply do not submit one.

113. Question: Is a MRCL needed because our company changed its name during the course of some projects?

Response: No, but provide evidence of the name change.

114. Question: If our business is submitting as a dba, do we need a MRCL between the two company names, even if they are the same entity? In the example, "ABC Group A dba ABC Group B," do you need to see a MRCL between "ABC Group A" and "ABC Group B?"

Response: Yes.

115. Question: Will the government allow companies to submit past performance and relevant experience that was accomplished as a subcontractor?

Response: No.

116. Question: If we do not need to submit a CTA, do we create a file that has the single line in it (named 'ABC.VOL1.CTA.PDF') stating that we are not submitting as a JV or Partnership?

Response: No.

117. Question: Can the government please clarify how you intend to calculate the annualized project values for our primary experience projects?

Response: Please see Section L.5.3.1

118. Question: For this section, is the only acceptable proof an FPDS-NG form, or will other forms of proof be accepted, such as those allowed in Section L.5.1.2?

Response: Any official documentation that verifies the required information is acceptable.

119. Question: Are secondary projects required to be with US government agencies?

Response: Yes.

120. Question: If we are not claiming any of the items called out in Volume 5, does the government expect us to provide a statement for each item that explains we are not claiming these?

Response: No.

121. Question: Under Solicitation GS00Q-13-DR-0001, Section L.5.1.2, can a single contract or task order (i.e., project) be used to satisfy more than one Pool Qualification? For instance, if a contract or task order under NAICS 541712 shows applicability to both Research and Development in Aircraft (Exception A) and Research and Development in Guided Missiles (Exception C), could that contract or task order be used as a pool qualification project for both Pool 6 and Pool 5B - if the Offeror submits evidence (i.e. SOW) that supports work performed in both Pools?

Response: Yes.

122. Question: Section H.4.2, Predominant Task Order NAICS Determination. The OASIS SB MA-IDIQ Table identifies Pool 3 as a size standard of \$35.5M performing in the NAICS of 541330, with Exception A, Engineering for Military and Aerospace Equipment and Weapons. Are we correct in our understanding that any proposed project for relevant experience in this pool must be specifically for Engineering for Military and Aerospace Equipment and Weapons?

Response: Section H has nothing to do with proposal submissions. Please see Sections L and M for proposal submission and evaluation.

123. Question: Page 127, Section M.5.2.5, 1st paragraph says If the Actual Percentage of Total Subcontract Awards meets or exceeds the Current Goal Percentage of Total Subcontract Awards, the Offeror will receive additional points for the project in accordance with the Scoring Table in Section M.6.

If an ISR shows that the total subcontracting goal was met, but individual subgoals were not, is this considered to have met the goals? As an example, subcontracting goal was 30% to small businesses with 3% to HUBZone. The contractor subcontracted 40% to small businesses but only 1% to HUBZone businesses. Has he met the goal?

Response: Yes.

124. Question: "If claiming credit for this scoring element, the Offeror must submit their Government Facility Clearance Level (FCL)." We have facility clearance granted by the Defense Security Service. We will submit Cage Code, company name and address with this submittal. Using this information GSA will verify our FCL in the Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD). There is no form or certification letter. Please clarify what information you require.

Response: No other information is required. Please just indicate on the proposal checklist and self scoring template whether your facility clearance is Secret or Top Secret.

125. Question: Please confirm that other contractual documents such as proposals, progress reports and invoices may be used as contract documentation to validate projects.

Response: Confirmed.

126. Question: If an offeror's bid includes affiliates that have separate forward pricing rate agreements, may offerors include multiple agreements in this section?

Response: Yes. Include them all.

127. Question: May offerors include a cover letter with their submissions?

Response: No. A cover letter is not required.

128. Question: Attachment 7 has an alternate template for Offerors to complete if a past performance citation is a collection of task orders from either a single-award IDIQ or a BPA. In some instances an Offeror's past performance citation may be neither a single-award IDIQ or BPA (as described in the FAR) but does include a collection of "task assignments" that are issued periodically (and the project is NOT funded by these task assignments.) Since the project is not a single-award IDIQ or a BPA as described in the FAR, and consequently the Offeror cannot answer Question 9 under the Project 5 alternate format, please confirm that the Offeror should use the regular project format to provide information about such a project.

Response: While we are uncertain of what kind of contractual arrangement you are referring to, Offerors may not submit separately awarded task orders as a "collection" for Relevant Experience unless those task orders were issued under a Single-Award IDIQ or Single-Award BPA. No exception.

129. Question: Reference RFP section L, paragraph L.5.5.5, page 110. In this paragraph GSA requests that the Offeror must provide verification of CMMI certification of level 3 or higher. Would GSA accept data from the

Published Appraisal Results (PARS) database as verification of certification? The PARS database is a repository of information maintained by the CMMI Institute and reported by authorized SCAMPI lead appraiser as a publicly accessible record of CMMI Maturity Level 3 Compliance.

Response: No.

130. Question: Reference RFP section L, paragraph L.5.5.8-5.5.9, pages 111-112. GSA is requiring verification through “a copy of the Offeror’s official audit report from an approved ISO....certification body”. These audit reports include our customer information which is protected under a Non Disclosure Agreement (NDA) or Protected Information Agreement (PIA) and cannot be shared with other business or Government entities. Request GSA allow an ISO certificate as one of the verification documents, and change the RFP to read: “Verification requirements include a copy of the Offeror’s official audit report or “certification document” from an approved ISO....certification body”

Response: The certification document is sufficient.

131. Question: We have noticed that the Government has provided direct labor ranges for Government site rates, but made no mention of Contractor-site rates. How should offerors differentiate between Government Site rates and Contractor Site rates or is the Government projecting no Contractor-site activity ?

Response: The direct labor ranges provided are for both Government and Contractor sites. Direct labor is what is actually paid to the contractor employee. It is our understanding that contractors do not pay their employees differently based upon site location. Our understanding is that the variance between Government site rates and Contractor site rates typically results from differences in indirect pools applied. Regardless of how your company addresses this, the direct labor rate ranges provided is what the evaluation team will use in determining fair and reasonable direct labor pricing for both Government site and Contractor site.

132. Question: Section L.4.4 is marked “Reserved”, but the proposal format table includes “Meeting or Exceeding Small Business Goals”. It appears this reference was taken from OASIS for use in the OASIS SB RFP. Small Businesses are rarely required to provide a subcontracting plan which illustrates the subcontracting to various socio-economic disciplines. It would seem the L.4 Table is not applicable for Small Businesses bidding OASIS SB. Which is correct?

Response: Both are correct. SBs are not required to submit SB Subcontracting plans, but may opt to do so voluntarily. Please see Section G.3.3.

133. Question: Are there only 20 awards across the country for Pool 5B?

Response: Yes, there will be 20 awards in Pool 5B.

134. Question: If only Prime contracts can be used and no teaming is allowed what basis does the GSA find its current requirements reasonably necessary to meet the agency’s need?

Response: To clarify, we do allow teaming at the IDIQ level. We just require those teams to have relevant experience just like all other Offerors. The requirements are based on more than three years of outreach, fact finding, data gathering, feedback, and requirement identification with clients and Industry. The contracts are for complex requirements and worth a substantial amount of money. Requiring Offerors (both JV and individual Prime alike) to have relevant experience performing these kinds of tasks seems reasonable to us, seems reasonable to our clients, and seems to be in the tax payers best interest.

135. Question: May offerors provide a table of contents and tabs to better organize and divide each bid pools projects' contract documentation for the purpose of facilitating the evaluation process?

Response: Yes.

136. Question: Please confirm whether or not GSA will accept supporting documentation in proposal responses that have with a label of "For Official Use Only". This type of documentation would include, for example, the screenshots from the Industrial Security Facilities Database for FCL description/verification and CPARS records.

Response: Confirmed. Offerors may submit FOUO documents.

137. Question: Please confirm that the Government requires only 5 projects to be submitted for Relevant Experience across OASIS, regardless of how many pools each Offeror is bidding, as opposed to submitting 5 projects per pool which could be different to maximize scoring in each pool.

Response: Confirmed. Offerors are to submit 5 Relevant Experience projects.

138. Question: Will the government clarify that if interim or final PPIRS information exists for a Relevant Experience (Primary) project, offerors should not provide Award Fee determination even if it exists?

Response: If CPARS information exists for Relevant Experience project, it should be provided. The order of priority is CPARS, then Award Fee, then Attachment J.8 Survey.

139. Question: In cases where a Relevant Experience (Primary) project has no small business goals, but the project chose to use small businesses to perform the work, may Offerors submit an ISR/SF 294 or SSR/SF 295 for that project to get credit for exceeding total small business goals?

Response: No. If no goals were established, then no points will be awarded.

140. Question: Can the government clarify that the definition of "work" for the purposes of scoring includes having members of the Offeror's project team stationed OCONUS, or any person or other resource of the project located OCONUS?

Response: No. OCONUS needs to be identified in contract documentation as a place of performance.

141. Question: RFP Reference: Page 103, Section L paragraph L.5.3.3.1 – Secondary Projects/Mission Spaces... indicates that the five relevant **Secondary** projects that meet the receive additional points for more than one (two-five) Mission Spaces. There is no mention of additional points for **Primary** projects that are performed in multiple mission spaces.

Request the GSA provide an opportunity for the offeror to receive these additional points using either or both Primary or Secondary Mission Spaces by amending section L.5.3.3.1 to include references to both Secondary and Primary projects.

Response: You may use your primary projects for Mission Space credit. See L.5.3.3.1, item number 3.

142. Question: RFP Reference: Page 101, Section L paragraph L.5.3.1 – Pass Fail Requirements indicates a collection of task orders under a Single Award IDIQ task order contract may be used as one of the references. Are multi-award IDIQ contracts also permitted?

Response: No. On multiple-award task orders, Contractors have no idea which task orders they will win or what tasks they will perform. Accordingly, they do not have to prepare and plan in the same fashion as they would for a single-award contract.

143. Question: With the wide diversity of primary project references, what criteria will the GSA use to judge what is and what isn't a primary purpose to distinguish ancillary support services?

Response: Contracting officer judgment.

144. Question: If an offeror submits a single task order from a multi-award IDIQ (MA-IDIQ) contract as a Primary project, and the only entry in PPIRS is a CPAR that covers the entire MA-IDIQ contract, can (or must) the offeror use the MA-IDIQ CPAR as the past performance information for the single task order?

Response: If a task order from a multiple-award contract does not have CPARS information or an Award Fee rating, an Attachment 8 survey must be completed.

145. Question: Solicitation Section L.6. Volume 6 – Cost/Price (Page 112) – The instructions state that “ceiling rates are to be based upon the highest qualified employee within a given labor category or group...”. If a contractor does not have employees that meet the qualifications for all labor category groups should the rates be based upon salary survey data? Or should the contractor leave the rates blank for those categories for which it does not have employees that meet those qualifications?

Response: Offerors shall provide rates for all categories however they deem appropriate.

146. Question: In Section J.7., Attachment (7), questions 3 asks the offeror to indicate which OASIS core Disciplines were performed on a certain project. The offeror is given 125 words to “*explain the rationale supporting your assertion that each Core Discipline was performed*” but there is no section that allows the offeror to indicate which documents and corresponding page numbers support any given assertion. Does the offeror need to explain documentation referencing within the 125 word count description?

Response: Yes.

147. Question: If a contractor applied the knowledge and skill necessary to build a IT system to enable one of the service areas listed, would that experience qualify under the Financial Management Services core discipline? For example, if a contractor created an IT system to support the “Oversight and Fraud Detection” service area (#11 on the list), would that experience qualify as a Financial Management Service?

Response: No. Offerors are to read and apply the core discipline definitions, not the examples.

148. Question: If there is a Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) available for a specific past performance citation, can that be utilized in lieu of the completion of Attachment 8 Past Performance Rating Form?

Response: The CPAR information must be used.

149. Question: Please provide guidance on the number of DVD+R disks the Government would like each Offeror to submit.

Response: One. If the information does not fit on a single DVD, then provide two disks that contain all of the information.

150. Question: Is it sufficient to highlight the Task Order award date on the Government contract document and make the assertion that the Multiple Award Contract under which the Task Order was awarded was active at the time of award to have current awarded TOs? Note that all Task Orders reference the Multiple Award Contract number.

Response: Offerors are to follow the instructions of L.5.3.3.2.

151. Question: For most of the labor categories, there is some overlap between the High rate for the lower position and the Low rate for the next higher-level position - as is to be expected. However there are 24 instances, reference attached file, where a sizeable gap exists between levels within a labor category, please see example below:

#93 Junior Scientists and Science Technicians Group 3 High: \$57.82

#94 Journeyman Scientists and Science Technicians Group 3 Low: \$69.41

Where the Offeror has a rate that falls within one of these gaps, please provide direction on how a rate should be mapped.

Response: Offerors are to provide pricing however they see fit. The ranges provided are simply the basis the Government will use in determining fair and reasonable pricing.

152. Question: The Oasis Modified Pre-Award Survey requires a signature from the individual responsible for the design of the Accounting System. There does not appear to be a digital signature capability on the document. Will the Government accept a scan of Section J.6 page one (1) with the signature of the individual responsible for the design of the Accounting System?

Response: Yes.

153. Question: For documentation supporting the number of subcontractors, will the Government accept excerpts of subcontract documents that substantiate the relationship? Basic contract documentation does not necessarily identify the program's subcontractors. The subcontract document establishes the relationship between the Prime and the Subcontractor.

Response: Yes.

154. Question: To aid the evaluators, may the Offeror provide an additional attachment that contains a file matrix identifying which contract documentation attachments satisfy which requirements for each program?

Response: Yes.

155. Question: (Ref. L.5.3.2.7) To receive the additional 100 points under Volume 3 (Relevant Experience), must an entire project be a cost-plus type contract or can elements (CLINs) be labeled as cost-reimbursable?

Response: The majority of the value of the contract must be cost-reimbursable.

156. Question: ref. L.5.3.2.5) With regard to a completed contract, when counting subcontractors to determine the number of subcontractors associated with a project, will the government count all subcontractors on the proposed team, or only subcontractors that actually performed work?

Response: Only subcontractors that actually performed work.

157. Question: What types of documentation should contractors submit in order to validate the number of subcontractors associated with a project? For instance, would a copy of the official invoice to the contractor be sufficient? Please respond in principle, and not just to the single potential example (invoice) provided here.

Response: Whatever documentation is sufficient to clearly demonstrate that subcontract work had been performed on the project identified.

158. Question: ref. L.5.3.1) The RFP indicates that average annual revenue for active projects will be based upon "total estimated value (inclusive of all options)" (see esp. L.5.3.1.2). Please clarify the methods of "estimation" that should be used in to determine the value of an in process task order. Since the current obligation would not reflect the total value, would the calculation be based upon the initially proposed value (accepted by the government), inclusive of all approved adjustments/modifications, as well as potential option periods and optional line items?

Response: Yes. See L.5.3.1 (item 3) for instructions.

159. Question: Will the evaluation approach require that the EXACT LANGUAGE of the RFP's core discipline definitions be matched, or will credit for relevance to a discipline be at the broader discretion of the evaluator?

Response: Discretion of the evaluator. All evaluators for this section will be senior contracting officers.

160. Question: It is apparent that, within any given PWS, a bidder may be able to identify and select many instances of language that demonstrates relevance to a core discipline. In the event that the chosen excerpt from a PWS is determined by an evaluator to be less than ideal (relevance deemed somewhat tenuous), will the bidder be afforded the opportunity – prior to having point allocations adjusted – to "clarify" the submission by providing an alternate excerpt that the evaluator may deem more acceptable?

Response: Offerors are strongly cautioned that proposal submissions need to be clear. Any discrepancy may result in a decrease to an Offeror's score or disqualification of an Offeror's proposal altogether (depending on circumstances). Clarifications may be conducted for better understanding of proposal contents, but Offerors will NOT be able to change their proposals based upon any clarifications. If an Offeror's rationale in identifying a core discipline or any other proposal element is not 100% clear, Offeror's are strongly encouraged to provide additional documentation to support the claim. For example, if engineering is being claimed as a core discipline, but engineering is not specifically mentioned in the text of the Statement of Work, then engineering labor categories identified in a cost/price proposal should be provided as well.

161. Question: In some cases, there is only a passing mention of relevant responsibilities. For instance, consider a scenario where a PWS does include the word "Program Management," but only once, and only in the general summary of the scope (ex. "The contractor will furthermore render all necessary Program Management services to support the operations...") Would such a one-time reference -- to Program Management, for example -- be sufficient to credit an offeror for the relevant mission area? For this item, please respond in principle, and not just to the example (Program Management) provided.

Response: Evaluators are going to apply the definitions present for each core discipline in Section C to the examples provided by Offerors for evaluation. Offerors are STRONGLY cautioned that all core disciplines claimed be clear and adequately supported within the documentation provided.

162. Question: ref. L.5.3.3.1) Does verification of mission areas require only a single secondary reference for each mission area (plus corresponding documentation that validates the reference)?

Response: Yes.

163. Question: Is there a particular form or report from FPDS that the government would like the contractor to submit in order to validate NAICS codes? Could the contractor simply include a standard FPDS excel export featuring relevant records in excel format? If so, what FPDS fields would the government like to have included in the report?

Response: Offerors are to submit sufficient documentation to validate whatever information is requested.

164. Question: Do the submitted FPDS records necessarily need to be the Mod 0 records for each task, or will any action suffice?

Response: Offerors are to submit sufficient documentation to validate whatever information is requested.

165. Question: Will a bidders score necessarily be lowered if PPIRS data is not available and the past performance questionnaire is used, or will the questionnaire receive the same weighting as the normal PPIRS data?

Response: The questionnaire receives the same weight.

166. Question: ref. L.5.3.3.2) With regard to the secondary references that will be used to demonstrate experience with MACs, please confirm that it is sufficient to merely submit enough documentation to meet the point validation requirements, and that documentation of EVERY individual task may not necessarily be required.

Response: Only documentation sufficient to meet the point validation requirements is necessary.

167. Question: Based on the language in section L.6. (Volume 6 – Cost/Price) fourth paragraph on page 112, it is our understanding that the submitted price list is to be used only for awards where inadequate competition is expected for sole source task orders. May we exceed the direct labor rates on our submitted price list for competitive task awards?

Response: Yes, you may price competitive task order proposals however you see fit and feel you can be competitive with based upon the individual task order requirements.

168. Question: Please clarify if we need to complete Section J.10 Attachment 10 in section L.5.3.3. through L.5.3.3.2. on page 103, the Relevant Experience Secondary Project Template, even if all 5 projects support the same mission space.

Response: Yes. You need to complete the form indicating you have supported one mission space. However, please keep in mind that the mission space projects are NOT limited to the 5 Relevant Experience projects.

169. Question: Are Secondary Project examples for Mission Space (Page 104, Section L.5.3.3.1, Item 1) and NAICS Pool Qualification Project examples (Page 91, Section L.5.1.2, Paragraph 1) required to be prime contracts or are subcontracts acceptable?

Response: Prime only.

170. Question: Is GSA planning to incorporate language into the final OASIS SB Pool contracts that will reflect the NDAA 2013 Limitations on Subcontracting language to allow small business primes and their like small business subcontractors to come together to meet the 51% small business delivery rule on Task Orders? While this decision

doesn't have a material impact to the OASIS Prime scoring, it is important to industry to make informed return on investment bid/no bid decisions.

Response: No. NDAA does not apply to the entire Government. OCOs may include the language at the task order level if it applies to their requirements.

171. Question: If a contract document is presented that the contractor believes substantiates a requirement for extra points, but the evaluation team does not concur, will this be considered "non-compliant" or will it simply mean the contractor will not be awarded the extra points?

Response: In most cases, this will likely mean that the Contractor will not be awarded the points claimed. However, if the discrepancy affects a pass/fail element, then this could result in disqualification of the offer.

172. Question: Because many of our CPARS entries are very recent, they have not transferred into the PPIRS. In these cases, will a copy of the CPARS report suffice in lieu of having the Government client also have to complete the Attachment (8) OASIS SB Past Performance Rating Form?

Response: If final from the Government, it may be submitted.

173. Question: The Solicitation Proposal Format Table states "documentation sufficient for validation is acceptable. Complete documentation not required unless necessary." Seeking clarification on two scenarios:

Scenario 1 (pages 87-88; section L; Proposal Format Table; Volume 1 Sections L.5.1.2, Volume 3 Sections L.5.3.1-L.5.3.2.8, L.5.3.3.-L.5.3.3.2.)

There are 10 pages of a 52 page Statement of Work which are needed to support work in the claimed Core Disciplines. The evaluation team only requires the 10 pages?

Response: Correct.

Scenario 2 (pages 106-107; section L, paragraph L.5.3.3.2.)

A company has a BPA with 190 task orders and a second BPA with ten task orders. In order to claim the additional points for Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders, would the company be required to submit ONLY a copy of two (2) task orders per BPA, (4 total) to qualify for the 50 points category? Or would the company need to submit all 200 task orders?

Response: Only the minimum number for the points claimed.

174. Question: If a contractor opts to select a particular project/contract to meet pool qualifications, but that project/contract does not have CPARs, may the contractor submit a J.8 Past Performance Rating Form to our customer to show evidence of a Past Performance rating of 3.0?

Response: If CPARS exist, it must be provided. Otherwise, Attachment J.8 may be provided.

175. Question: Ref L.5.1.4 Page 93, Section J.5, Attachment 5A; L.5.3.2.1, Page 102; M.5.1.1, Page 118.

The second paragraph under L.5.3.2.1 states: "In other words, a project under NAICS Code 541330 Exception A would receive the additional points if the project was reported in FPDS-NG under NAICS Code 541330 only."

Where in the J.5 Self Scoring spreadsheet are the additional points for meeting NAICS Code 541330 Exception A to be reported?

Response: Blocks D12 – D16.

176. Question: Pg. 89; L.4. Proposal Format, referencing L.5.5.5 with two file requirements, one to be labeled .cert and the other .ref. It also calls for a document “*NTE 1 page for POC information.*” In Section L.5.5.5., however, the documentation required is:

Verification requirements include a copy of the Offeror’s official audit report from a CMMI Instituted Certified Lead Appraiser.

Question: Is the offeror to attach the POC information to the audit report and submit a .pdf of the certificate, or is the offeror to submit only the audit report and the POC information?

Response: Certificate with POC information.

177. Question: Pg. 90; L.4. Proposal Format, referencing L.5.5.10 it has a file requirement, however, page 112; L.5.5.10 states:

For each Offeror claiming credit for an FCL, verification will be done by the OASIS SB PMO contacting the Defense Security Service (DSS)

Question: Is there no longer a proposal documentation requirement for this element?

Response: That is correct.

178. Question: Since we have done several projects as a small business under 541330, can we bid as a Small Business for the pools 1 & 3, even though starting this year we are above the \$35.5 Million size standard?

Response: If you cannot certify as small for the \$35.5M size standard, then you may not apply as a Small Business.

179. Question: Can we bid as a large business for these pools 1 & 3?

Response: Yes.

180. Question: The OCO may allow and the Contractor may propose a labor category or labor categories at the task order level not identified in Section J.1...” Please clarify if the proposed “new” labor category or labor categories will become a permanent part of Section J.1 once the additional labor category is accepted for a given Task Order.

Response: The labor category will apply for that task order, but not the applicable OASIS contract.

181. Question: “GSA reserves the right to review and approve any marketing, promotional, or news releases...” Although the GSA reserves the right to review and approve, does the Contractor have to obtain permission from GSA prior to publishing its own marketing materials and/or new releases?

Response: If it pertains to the OASIS contracts, then yes.

182. Question: “Dormant Status is a condition that applies to the OASIS SB contract only.” Why does the dormant status only apply to OASIS SB and not OASIS?

Response: Dormant status applies to both contracts.

183. Question: “All proposal documents shall be in Adobe (.pdf) format...” Given the number of individual files required for proposal submission, does the Government want Offerors to submit files for areas where Offerors do not possess the requisite documentation? For example, Volume 1, Section L.5.1.8 Subcontracting Plan is an optional submission, if Offerors choose to not submit a Subcontracting Plan, does the Government still require Offerors to submit the corresponding file (ABC.COL1.SP.pdf) simply stating Offerors are exercising the option to not submit a Subcontracting Plan.

Response: No. Only submit files applicable to your offer.

184. Question: As Offerors are allowed to apply for multiple POOLs using one proposal submission, will the Offeror be eligible for a contractor award for the eligible POOL(s) if the Offeror is found to be ineligible for one of the POOLs?

Response: Yes, unless ineligibility is based upon fraudulent or misleading proposal submissions.

185. Question: "Relevant Experience is divided into two separate categories, Primary Projects and Secondary Projects...2. The Secondary category of relevant experience applies to scoring criteria associated...These projects can be based on any set of projects the Offeror chooses to submit..." Please confirm the projects associated with the Secondary category do not have to be the same as the Primary category provided they comply with the instructions in L.5.3.3.

Response: Confirmed.

186. Question: "If claiming credit for this scoring element, the Offeror must submit their Government Facility Clearance Level (FCL)." Please confirm a statement from Offerors indicating their FCL is acceptable to the Government as the correspondence from the Defense Security Service (DSS) granting Offerors their FCL strictly prohibits making copies of the approval letter.

Response: Simply indicating the clearance level on the proposal checklist and self-scoring form is sufficient.

187. Question: "These ceiling rates are to be based upon the highest qualified employee within a given labor category or group, working in the highest paid area within CONUS, on a highly complex requirement..." If the aforementioned assumptions are used, Offerors are instructed to use the maximum or highest direct labor rate within the Government provide direct labor rate range in Attachment 2. Please confirm this interpretation is correct.

Response: Offerors are not instructed to do anything with the provided Direct Labor Ranges. Offerors are to submit pricing commensurate with the instructions of the solicitation. The ranges provided are simply a courtesy by the evaluation team. These are the direct labor rates we will use in determining fair and reasonable pricing.

188. Question: "The Offeror's subcontracting plan must be determined acceptable." As the Subcontracting Plan is optional, how will the Government determine acceptability of the Subcontracting Plan if Offerors choose not to submit one and how does this affect the pass/fail nature of Volume 1 – General?

Response: For OASIS SB, the subcontracting plan will be evaluated for acceptability, but will not factor into any pass/fail determination. This is a separate exercise strictly for the benefit of the Offeror in the future.

189. Question: "In accordance with the table, a point value will be assigned an adjectival rating that was given a score." As CPARS may have multiple ratings over the life of a contract, how with the Government determine which rating to utilize? Will the Government average all ratings to derive a single rating or will the Government evaluate only the most current CPAR rating?

Response: We will use the final rating if available, if not available, we will use the most current.

190. Question: "In accordance with the table, a point value will be assigned the adjectival rating." As award fee contracts typically have multiple award fee ratings, how with the Government determine which rating to utilize? Will

the Government average all award fee ratings to derive a single rating or will the Government evaluate only the most current award fee rating?

Response: Most current.

191. Question: RFP Section L.6 states that *'These ceiling rates are to be based upon the highest qualified employee within a given labor category or group, working in the highest paid area within CONUS, on a highly complex requirement, excluding Secret/Top Secret/SCI.* If the stated assumption is that Offerors are to utilize these government assumptions in proposing Direct Labor rates, under what scenario would an Offeror be expected to use any DL rate other than the maximum DL provided in J-2, as that, by definition, reflects those very assumptions? Secondly, if all Offerors use that rationale and use the maximum DL provided (maximum that sets the high range), other companies could then easily reverse engineer OASIS awardees' wrap rates, which is regarded as highly proprietary information within industry.

Response: First, there are no expectations regarding Offeror pricing. The direct labor rate information is provided as a courtesy. Offerors may propose as they see fit. Finally, these rates will not be publicly available.

192. Question: "Using the Past Performance Rating Form in Attachment (8), the Offeror shall provide the survey directly to each of the references, as applicable, and instruct each rater to send a completed form directly back to the Offeror.... The Offeror must follow up with each rater to ensure the Past Performance Rating Forms were received and completed prior to the proposal closing date," Please clarify whether references are to submit past performance rating forms directly to the offerors for inclusion into the proposal, or if references should submit past performance rating forms directly to the government prior to the proposal closing date.

Response: References should provide past performance ratings to the Offerors to be included in the final proposal. Offerors should know what ratings they have been given. The evaluation team will verify the ratings as part of the evaluation process. If rating information is changed, altered, or otherwise falsified, the offer will be disqualified.

193. Question: Regarding page 87 of RFP, are there page limitation on L.5.1.2.?

Response: No.

194. Question: On OASIS SB, Subcontracting plan is not necessary to be submitted. If a company in future grows beyond the small business category defined in the RFP, will the company be required to submit subcontracting plan at that time before being placed into unrestricted pool?

Response: A subcontracting plan is required as part of the proposal process for OASIS, even for companies being on-ramped.

195. Question: According to the RFP, a company can use past performance/relevant experience from its wholly-owned subsidiary as it's both primary and secondary past performance/relevant experience. Please confirm that.

Response: Confirmed.

196. Question: Can a GSA schedule such as 70 and 36 be considered a Multiple Award Contract for the purposes stated in pages of 107 of RFP?

Response: No. We are looking for competitively awarded contracts like OASIS.

197. Question: Regarding section L.5.5.1. Approved Purchasing System of page 109 of RFP: Approved Purchase System is not mandatory in the OASIS RFP, but DCAA audited Accounting System is. However, DCAA Accounting System can be after awardee is selected, why not Approved Purchase System?

Response: Accounting systems are required and DCAA audit of those systems, when required, will occur prior to contract awards.

198. Question: If an order was issued on a Multiple Award Contract and as Delivery Order (DO) # 100 (hypothetical #) and a follow on DO was issued as DO #150 with the following statement, "DO # 150 was issued for funding and administrative purposes as a continuation of Task Order 100. The terms and conditions of DO # 100 remain unchanged and are incorporated within this Task Order. (Section C, Descriptions and Specifications are identical on both 100 and 150). Would this scenario constitute two (2) Relevant Experience reference or one (1) relevant experience? If it is one (1) Relevant Experience can the value of the two orders be combined into the one (1) relevant experience reference?

Response: Why this would not have been accomplished as a modification to DO 100 is unclear to us, but given the specifics of the example as stated, that would count as a single relevant experience project and the orders could be combined. Please note that the evidence for something of this nature needs to be extremely clear.

199. Question: Concerning L5.1.2 subparagraph 2 (Pg 91): This section states that the offeror "shall have performed **Two (2)** Pool Qualification projects under a NAICS Code or NAICS Code Exception that corresponds directly to a NAICS Code or NAICS Code Exception in the Pool being applied for." Is there a minimum dollar value requirement for the projects used to satisfy this requirement? Could these projects be subcontracts?

Response: No, there is no dollar value associated with Pool Qualification projects and no, they cannot be subcontracts.

200. Question: These paragraphs require that the "Offeror must provide excerpts of contract documentation that substantiate" various elements of a contract/task order used as OASIS Relevant Experience (Primary). The elements concerned in these paragraphs consist of: Contract or Task Order Number; Prime Contractor; Current Status; Period of Performance; Type of Vehicle; Annual Average Dollar Value per Year; and Contract Type. In the overwhelming majority of cases, all of this information can be found on the Federal Procurement Data System - Next Generation (FPDS-NG) print-out. Will the government accept the print-out data in FPDS-NG as contract documentation that substantiates the contract/task order elements identified in each of the above-described Section J7 paragraphs?

Response: Yes.

201. Question: Page 83, Section L.2.2, Para 5 and Page 71 Section K.2, Para 3 states, "Pool 3, OASIS SB MA-IDIQ...NAICS Code for this acquisition is: 541330 Exception A" while Pages 45 and 93 lists Exception A, B, and C. Please confirm all Exceptions apply.

Response: Confirmed.

202. Question: Page 104, Section L.5.3.2.4 Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Multiple Locations, Para 1, does "location" refer to contractor and Government sites/locations?

Response: This refers to any location contractually identified as a place of performance.

203. Question: Referencing Section L.5.5.2, paragraph 2, page 110: The solicitation lists the verification requirements as including "... Offeror's official FPRA, FPRR, Approved Billing Rates, audit report and audit report number...". Being that an FPRA or FPRR is the result of bilateral or unilateral negotiations, please confirm the requirement for audit report and audit report number are in reference to the Approved Billing Rates requirement only.

Response: Confirmed.

204. Question: Question: Both Excel File Attachments (J.5, Self Scoring Worksheet, and J.9, Cost/Price Template) are provided in .xlsx format, yet the table indicates the file name should be .xls. In which version of Excel should the file be provided: .xlsx or .xls?

Response: Either is fine.

205. Question: Please confirm all solicitation references to ORCA and the CCR are to the System for Award Management.

Response: Confirmed.

206. Question: Please confirm that a subcontracting plan must be determined acceptable only if required, and a subcontracting plan is not mandatory for small-business offerors.

Response: Confirmed.

207. Question: If the period of performance starts or ends sometime within a month, for example 9/25/2011, is that counted as a whole month calculating the annual value of a contract?

Response: No. The calculation is determined by a combination of the start date and the end date. For example, if a project period of performance is 9/25/2011 – 9/24/2012, the period of performance is 12 months.

208. Question: Question 9 on J.7 Attachment: Places of Performance instructs us to include both CONUS and OCONUS locations when answering. Please verify that you want us to restate the answer already given in earlier question 4 regarding OCONUS locations.

Response: Yes. Number of locations and OCONUS are different questions.

209. Question: L.5.4.2 states, "... if the Government has performed an Award Fee determination in accordance with TABLE 16-1 under FAR 16.401 in lieu of interim or final past performance ratings in PPIRS, the Award Fee determination from the Government agency must be submitted." Would the Government consider allowing Offers to submit only the highlighted "excerpts" of the Award Fee Letter with highlighting that identifies the Adjectival Award Fee Ratings, rather than submitting the entire award fee letter which contains company proprietary data not relevant to the OASIS solicitation?

Response: No, the award fee documentation needs to be submitted in whole. Any proprietary data contained in proposal submissions remains proprietary and is treated accordingly.

210. Question: L.5.5.6-L.5.5.9 states, "Verification requirements include a copy of the Offeror's official audit report from an approved ISO". Due to the company sensitive information on these audit reports, would the Government consider allowing Offers to submit a copy of the ISO certifications and the POC of the certified body for verification in lieu of the audit report?

Response: Certifications only. See amended solicitation.

211. Question: Novation Letter. Do you require one for each project submitted or can we submit one for all 5?

Response: One is fine if it sufficiently covers all projects.

212. Question: Multiple Locations. Additional points are given for projects with more than 5 locations. Do you only want us to submit the 5 locations even though there are more than 5 for documentation?

Response: Only 5 are required.

213. Question: Award Fee Determinations given to Projects contain the FAR 16.401 adjectival rating tables. Please clarify why the Project 3 Example on page 125 limits the Award Fee point value to only 3 points (essentially no additional points are awarded) when the same adjectival ratings as PPIRS/CPARs would give Offerors higher scoring when using the same calculations of those projects with PPIRS/CPARs? Will the Government allow Offerors to use same calculations offered on PPIRS/CPARs given that the same adjectival ratings are used rather than the 3 pts?

Response: There were errors in the example. These are fixed in the amended solicitation.

214. Question: If Offeror is not responding to all positions, what nomenclature would GSA like to see in the Direct Labor Rate column, or "blank"?

Response: Offerors must respond to all labor categories or will not be eligible for award.

215. Question: If Offeror modifies template to accommodate FCCOM on the Contractor site rate tab; how would the GSA like to see this noted?

Response: Any clear and easy to understand formatting is acceptable.

216. Question: SF Form 33, Block 15c. "Check if remittance address is different from above - enter such address in schedule". Where is the information to be entered or how should it be provided since there is no such schedule?

Response: If your remittance address is different than you may include a cover page with your SF 33 providing that information.

217. Question: L.5.3.1, bullet 1 states that the Five (5) distinct relevant experience projects must "involve the performance and/or integration of at least Four (4) out of the Six (6) OASIS Core Disciplines." Please confirm that 4 out of the 6 disciplines must be covered across ALL 5 projects versus each project covering at least 4 out of the 6.

Response: This contract is designed for complex, integrated services. Each project must must include 4 of the 6 core disciplines.

218. Question: For Task Orders submitted against a Multiple Award Contract, form DD1155 requires that Block 16 identify the date the Contracting Officer awarded/signed the form. However, within that Block 16 there is a check box stating "If this box is marked, supplier must sign Acceptance". Please verify that if this box is NOT marked, the Date of Order/Call in Block 3 will suffice.

Response: Confirmed.

219. Question: This section includes a requirement under 5. and 6. that (regardless of order type) Contractors must report the "Amount of invoice that was subcontracted" and "Amount of invoice that was subcontracted to a small business." Please note this detail relating to subcontractor charges would vary per the individual order requirements and type of order. Separate charges for Subcontractors are not always noted separately on an invoice - and even if so, the individual Subcontractors' names would not be noted. In addition, the size classification of the Subcontractor would not be noted on the invoice. To include this requirement would place an undue administrative burden on the Contractors. Frequently, a Corporate employee would be entering data into the OMM based on invoices submitted by divisions through the company. This process should be simply a matter of entering information as reflected on the invoice submitted to a Customer in accordance with the Task Order requirements.

Response: This requirement will not change. There are administrative and reporting requirements for GSA and our clients that all reported information ties into.

220. Question: Modified Pre-Award Survey: These Survey items require copies of most recent audit reports/documentation and validation. How should the Contractor provide for Disclosure Statements that have been submitted but not yet audited by DCAA - therefore, no determination has been issued?

Response: If they have not yet been audited by DCAA then you are not required to submit them

221. Question: Modified Pre-Award Survey: This Survey item asks if our organization has been notified by DCAA that it is in (or may be in) noncompliance with its disclosure statement or CAS. Please clarify if this question relates to current practices? If not, how many years prior does it pertain to?

Response: Whether or not "current" practices are in compliance or not.

222. Question: J7 Subcontracting: Ref Section J.7, Attachment 7, Question 8- Subcontracting/Teaming. The question asks contractors to identify subcontracting/teaming partners and the work being done by each of them. It is a simple task for the contractor PM to name the subcontractors and describe the work they perform. Question 8 also requires contract documentation to substantiate the subcontracting/teaming performed. It is a difficult task to find and pull documentation of subcontractor work performed especially for projects that ended a few years ago and those that are FFP. Is it sufficient to provide contract documentation (such as a monthly status report or subcontractor expenditures report) that shows all the subcontractors who worked on the contract, but does not include the specific work being performed by each?

Response: Yes.

223. Question: J7 Locations: Ref Section J.7, Attachment 7, Question 9- Locations. The question asks contractors to identify locations and describe the work being performed at each location. The note in Question 9 only asks to substantiate the place of performance. Is it correct to assume that offerors do not have to provide documentation of the work performed at each location?

Response: That is correct.

224. Question: J7 Use of CPAR: Ref Section J.7, Attachment 7. Since the CPAR is from an official Government report reviewed by both the contracting officer and the contractor, would the most current or final CPAR report qualify as acceptable contract documentation to support responses to questions related to NAICS Code,

period of performance, contract type, total estimated dollar value, locations where work is performed, and number of subcontractors?

Response: If that information is contained in the CPARS documentation, then yes.

225. Question: J7 Documentation: Ref Section J.7, Attachment 7. Does the contractor's proposal in response to the solicitation for a contract, as accepted by the government upon award, qualify as acceptable contract documentation to support responses to questions in attachment 7? For example, to show labor categories used and usage of particular subcontractors.

Response: For labor categories yes, for subcontractors no.

226. Question: Pool Certification: Can CPARS be used to verify NAICS Codes?

Response: Yes, so long as it does not conflict with FPDS.

227. Question: Pool Certification: If an FPDS-NG report is not available at the task order level, can we use the IDIQ vehicle report to certify NAICS Codes for task orders?

Response: If no NAICS code is assigned to the task order, then Yes.

228. Question: Accounting System: This paragraph and survey # specify that the Offeror must attach their most current audit of their Accounting System (or most recent DCAA audit report) to the Modified Pre-Award Survey (SF-1408) template. Please note that although an offeror's Accounting System may have been audited and an assessment provided by DCAA to DCMA, that assessment is not necessarily provided to the Contractor. Contractors are not always privy to documentation provided by DCAA to DCMA. It is possible that an Audit Report may not be issued as a result of the audit/assessment. As a result of the DCAA audit/assessment, DCMA may notify a Contractor that their Accounting System is acceptable (without providing further documentation). It is requested that GSA modify this paragraph and survey to request a copy of an audit or audit report only if one is available and it has been provided to the Contractor. Absent that, the Contractor should be able to provide a copy of the DCMA letter that informs the Contractor that their Accounting System is acceptable and has been approved.

Response: No change is necessary. Provide what documentation you have and DCAA will verify it.

229. Question: Reference: Page 91, L.5.1.2. Pool Application and Certification, Item 4. Question: None of our Government projects are numerically scored in PPIRS. How do we present pool qualification projects that have a past performance rating of 3.0 or higher?

Response: Have a survey completed.

230. Question: Section M.5.1.6. of the RFP (page 120) defines Ancillary Support Services as "services that are not included in the primary scope of work of the project, but rather, are outside the primary scope of work, but are integral and necessary to the overall requirement." Given that the scope of the OASIS contract and the evaluation criteria for Relevant Experience Primary Projects focus on professional services, as opposed to administrative or IT services, this offeror interprets administrative, clerical, and IT support services to be defined as "ancillary" under the definition proposed in Section M.5.1.6. These types of services are often cited in a project's statement of work, being necessary and integral to the overall requirements of the contract, but they are not the primary focus of professional services contracts. Therefore, it is this offeror's interpretation that, for evaluation purposes under Section M, the government will consider administrative, clerical, and IT support services to be "Ancillary Support Services." Is this interpretation correct?

Response: Correct.

231. Question: GSA allows for non-federal contracts to be used for relevant experience projects; however GSA states that the Offeror must attach documentation of the NAICS code for each relevant experience project. Please confirm that Section L.5.3.2.1 only applies to federal projects where the offeror wishes to receive additional points for an OASIS NAICS code.

Response: Confirmed.

232. Question: The second paragraph of this section states, "The template must be signed by the individual responsible for the design of the Offeror's Accounting System." Please change this requirement to read, "The template must be signed by the individual responsible for the Offeror's Accounting System." This change would allow compliance for those offerors whose designers are no longer in their employ.

Response: If the designer is not available, please have the person responsible for the system sign.

233. Question: Would the Government consider adding language to this section to create a means to allow a contractor whose contract has been placed on Dormant status to regain active contract status during the 5 year option period? A contractor may, after the determination by the Government to make a contract Dormant, develop new capabilities or competitive qualifications that increase ability to win awards thereby increasing the competitiveness of OASIS acquisition for that pool(s).

Response: Dormant status is not permanent status. No change is required.

234. Question: Reference Pages 44 through 46, Section H.4.2: This section delineates 6 different pools for determining predominate NAICS codes for task orders awarded under any resultant contracts. The Pool Application and Certification included as part of Section J.3, Attachment 3 also delineates these 6 different pools. However, the Cost/Price Template included in Section J.9, Attachment 9 makes reference to "Groups" 1 through 5 for labor categories 33 through 104.

Is the term "Group" meant to be synonymous with "Pool"?

Response: No.

What Group or Pool applies to labor categories 1-33?

Response: None. These are ungrouped, individual labor categories.

Why are there no Group 6 labor categories specified in Section J.9, Attachment 9?

Response: Because labor category groups have nothing to do with Pools. Please read Section B.2.1 regarding labor category grouping.